



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/105,528	06/26/1998	NICHOLAS JOLYAN STANIFORT KNOWLES	CR9-98-062	5684

25259 7590 05/01/2002

IBM CORPORATION  
3039 CORNWALLIS RD.  
DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12195  
REASEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

LE, UYEN T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 05/01/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/105,528

Applicant(s)

Knowles

Examiner

Uyen Le

Art Unit

2171



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 5, 2002
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Request for Reconsideration***

1. Applicant argues the finality of the Office Action mailed 4 June 2001. In response, the amendments to claims 1, 8, 15 clearly changed the scope of the claims, thus necessitated the new grounds of rejection which resulted in the finality of the Office Action mailed 4 June 2001.

2. Applicant's arguments regarding Fintel (US 5,903,478) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Fintel does not teach or suggest an "object model" per se. In response, Fintel clearly shows an object model since the model is a business object model (see column 7, lines 25-50).

Applicant argues that Figure 181 of Fintel does not show "a subprocess for retrieving and displaying relationship information from said model when said selected element is a component of said model". In response, the claimed selected elements are met by the data of Customer, Product, Service, Sales Transaction Items, Market, Competitor, Product Price shown in Figure 181. These elements are clearly selected from the business model (see Figure 178, column 43, lines 20-28). The claimed relationship information is met by the matrix showing the selected data with respect to locations of Headquarter Location, Sales Office and Customer Home of Figure 181. Figure 181 clearly shows the components of the object model and the selection of the

Art Unit: 2171

components clearly causes relationship information to be retrieved and displayed in the matrix.

Applicant admits that in Fintel, a user may create or delete a relationship through a menu box shown in Figure 182 but questions whether this is "displaying relationship information". In response, the examiner is having trouble understanding how applicant could argue that a user creates or deletes a relationship without displaying it.

Regarding claim 1, Applicant argues that there is no apparent description or discussion of a user selecting a relationship in Figures 175-201. In response, Figure 182 for example clearly shows that the user can edit a relationship. The examiner is having trouble understanding how applicant could argue that relationships are edited without being selected.

Applicant presents no further argument. For all the reasons discussed above, rejection to all claims is maintained using the references of record.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fintel et al (US 5,903,478) of record.

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claim 1, the claimed computer readable code for implementing a visually-oriented technique for navigating an object model is met by the fact that the system of Fintel allows displaying and navigating an architecture visual model including a plurality of objects (see the abstract, column 2, lines 15-44, column 7, lines 25-50). The claimed sub process for displaying a browser merely reads on the fact that the system of Fintel includes user interfaces used to edit the model. The claimed sub process for retrieving and displaying a set of elements in said browser, said elements representing said object model is met when the system retrieves and displays information data such as Competitor, Customer, Demographics, Market, Part, Product , Product Price, Sales Transaction Item, Service, for users to select (see Figures 178-181, column 43, line 20- column 44, line 7 ). The claimed sub process for enabling a user to select one of said elements, sub process for retrieving and displaying relationship information from said model when said selected element is a component of said model and sub process for enabling said user to select one or more relationships from said displayed relationship information are met when Fintel shows that a matrix of relationships is displayed upon user's selection of Customer, Product , Service, Sales Transaction Item, Market, Competitor, Product Price data and that the user can navigate and edit relationships (see Figures 175-201, especially Figure 178 showing selection of data and Figure 182 showing editing properties). Clearly, in order to edit relationships, all the claimed sub routines have to be present in the system taught by Fintel.

Regarding claim 7, Fintel shows a conventional browser (see Figures 194, 195).

Art Unit: 2171

Claims 8, 14 correspond respectively to a system for the computer program product of claims 1, 7, therefore are rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 1, 7 above.

Claim 15 corresponds to a method for the computer program product of claim 1, therefore is rejected for the same reasons stated in claim 1 above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3-6, 10-13, 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fintel et al (US 5,903,478) of record, in view of applicant's admitted prior art at pages 3-5, 25.

Regarding claims 3, 5, although Fintel does not explicitly show an action list, applicant admitted that techniques for performing action choices are well known in the art (see page 25, line 4). Since the browser in the system of Fintel is an interactive tool for developing an object model, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a sub process for presenting an action list in order to allow the user to navigate through possible actions with each element.

Regarding claim 4, since relationships possess different characteristics, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the action list actions tailored to the selected one or more relationships.

Regarding claim 6, official notice is taken that it is well known in the art to filter an action list to limit the choices appropriate to each model. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include filtering the action list while implementing the code in order to limit the actions appropriate to each model in the system of Fintel.

Claims 10-13, 17-20 correspond respectively to a system and method for the computer program product of claims 3-6, therefore are rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 3-6 above.

### ***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen T Le whose telephone number is 703-305-4134. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-5:30.

Art Unit: 2171

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



Uyen Le  
April 23, 2002



SAFET METJAHIC  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100